

7478

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 8

the Senate and other interested persons that the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has scheduled a hearing on S. 855 and S. 915, both of which deal with metropolitan area planning. The hearing will be held at 10:30 a.m. beginning on May 21.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify at the hearing should notify the subcommittee, room 357, Senate Office Building, extension 4718, in order that he might be scheduled as a witness.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks before the first plenary session of the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1963.

By Mr. BURDICK:

Address delivered by Hon. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, to Law School Honor's Day Student Bar Association at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak., on April 27, 1963, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964-65, delivered at the dedication of the Press Building, Flushing Meadows, Long Island, on May 4, 1963.

Address by Dr. Ralph T. Collins, delivered at a meeting of the Minnesota Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, relating to the problem of mental disease.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Statement of 53 university foreign language and area center directors on title VI of the National Defense Education Act.

Statement of the American Jewish Congress Governing Council on Peace in the Middle East.

Memorandum on relations between church and state, written by Raymond L. Wise.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Continuing No-Win Policy Avenue to Disaster," published in the Nashville Banner of May 3, 1963.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Editorial entitled "Whither the Truth-in-Lending Bill?" published in the Department Store Journal of April 17, 1963.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Editorial on electric intertie legislation, published in the Sacramento Bee of April 18, 1963.

By Mr. KEATING:

Article entitled "Soviet Oil Trade a Confidence Trick," written by C. L. Sulzberger and published in the New York Times.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Must Equality Hold Us Back From Excellence?" written by Joe Stroud and published in the Arkansas Gazette of April 21, 1963.

Article entitled "Jesus, the Most Beloved Man, the Humblest and Greatest of All," written by Judge John Park Cravens.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Article entitled "Fish Flour Fracas," published in the Wall Street Journal, issue of May 8, 1963, relating to the use of fish protein concentrate to relieve suffering from malnutrition.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Article entitled "Hero Goes Back to White House," published in the Evening Republican, Columbus, Ind.

Editorial entitled "Youth Dependable, Too," published in the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind., on April 30, 1963.

By Mr. COTTON:

Column entitled "Ponzi Did It First," written by Austen Lake and published in the Boston (Mass.) Record American on February 14, 1963.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Column entitled "A Foreign Academy—To Match the Communists," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Washington (D.C.) Post of May 8, 1963.

By Mr. BEALL:

Poem entitled "Two-Party System," written by Mr. Hyman Pressman.

V-E DAY—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the majority leader. I indicated that today was the 18th anniversary of V-E Day. It is a day suitably to be observed. A number of speeches will be delivered on this side of the aisle, and perhaps on the other side of the aisle, in commemoration of that event. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the 3-minute rule, I may be recognized so that I may recognize other Senators for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Texas.

CUBA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on V-E Day, the United States stood on a pinnacle, universally respected and triumphant. Today our international standing has slipped low indeed. The primary reason can be summed up in one short word—Cuba.

Every American knows what Cuba means, hard as that little group of theorists clustered around 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue try to twist it. Cuba means that an enemy, intent upon our destruction, is based 90 miles away. Cuba means that we have endangered our children's future by forgetting that vigilance is the eternal price of freedom. Cuba means we have abandoned our Christian neighbors next door to atheistic terrorists.

Worldwide, Cuba invokes an image of a weak and wavering United States.

In permitting what has happened in Cuba, we have cast aside the traditions of this Nation as embodied in the Monroe Doctrine and have reneged on carrying out our solemn obligation under the Rio, Caracas, and Bogotá Treaties. We have done violence to the charter of the Organization of American States, which binds member states to assist each other "to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence."

We have demoralized and discouraged those Latin American Republics who, threatened by Communist subversion, have urged us to take tough and decisive steps to purge Soviet colonialism from this hemisphere.

This, I may comment, is quite different from the speed with which the late, great John Foster Dulles had the Red regime broken in Guatemala.

It seems worthy to note that, a decade and a half before the Monroe Doctrine, Jefferson's Cabinet put itself on record as against the acquisition of Cuba by Britain or France, the world powers then. President Polk tried to buy Cuba for \$120 million and President Pierce for \$120 million. Down through our history we have recognized that, because of proximity, the Cuban-American relations were special.

After the Cubans rose in revolt in 1895, we went to war with Spain to aid them. The Organic Act of Cuba—her first constitution—declared that no foreign power was to secure partial or complete control of the island and authorized the United States to intervene in Cuba, if necessary, to prevent this.

President Kennedy himself stood in 1960 upon a Democratic Party platform which unequivocally declared:

The new Democratic administration will also reaffirm our historic policy of opposition to the establishment anywhere in the Americas of governments dominated by foreign powers, a policy now being undermined by Soviet threats to the freedom and independence of Cuba.

Nevertheless, we have followed a policy more fit for a Byzantine emperor than a great modern world power, and straightforward world power like the United States. We denied at the time we had anything to do with participation in the U.S. conceived, U.S. prepared, and U.S. directed Cuban landing force at the Bay of Pigs. One result of this hypocritical policy was that the landing was made without adequate air cover or support.

Three days after that disaster, President Kennedy appeared before the Nation's editors here and said:

If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government would not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are the security of the Nation.

Mr. Kennedy made a similar statement to the released Cuban prisoners he saw fit to address in Miami despite the fact he had repudiated them on landing day. Both statements were widely interpreted to mean Mr. Kennedy would help liberate Cuba.

Instead, he has repudiated the Cubans he once induced to risk their lives and the leader he selected for them.

On this V-E Day, I would recall to the President's mind the further pledge of his platform:

The Government of the United States under a Democratic administration will not be deterred from fulfilling its obligations and solemn responsibilities under its treaties and agreements with the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international atheistic communism in the Western Hemisphere.

I ask, along with the American people, why this pledge has not been kept.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7477

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should take such action as he may deem appropriate to provide for the conduct, by a conference including representatives of small business organizations, of a comprehensive study and investigation to determine (1) the economic effect of the antitrust laws of the United States upon the operations of small business organizations, (2) the respects in which such laws are advantageous, and the respects in which such laws may be disadvantageous, to the economic success of small business organizations, and (3) the nature and extent of any revision of such laws which may be necessary or appropriate to facilitate effective competition by small business organizations with business organizations having greater economic resources.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate today Executive F, 88th Congress, 1st session, the international agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the agreement, and that the agreement, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the international agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea, which was open for signature from February 20, 1962 to August 19, 1962, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and seven other countries.

The agreement primarily concerns the sharing of the costs of maintaining the lights as aids to navigation, and is further explained in the report of the Secretary of State, which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The White House, May 8, 1963.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. International agreement on maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea, opened for signature February 20, 1962.

REQUEST FOR ENGROSSED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 5 OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE TO BE EXPUNGED FROM RECORD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana was laid before the Senate and referred to

the appropriate committee. The resolution appears in the Record of the above date on page 3408 as "Engrossed House Joint Resolution 5."

Recently, I received a letter from the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of Indiana, regarding this resolution. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Welsh's letter be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 28, 1963.
Hon. R. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VANCE: With further reference to "Engrossed House Joint Resolution No. 5," it is my feeling that this resolution on the Liberty amendment should be expunged from the permanent Record since it passed only one house of the legislature and is not an action of the general assembly of our State.

Very best,

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in accordance with the Governor's wishes as expressed in his letter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Engrossed House Joint Resolution No. 5" be expunged from the permanent Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, NORTH DAKOTA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on subsequent printings of Senate bill 187 to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield) appear as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRAWLERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 744) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern steam-ramp trawlers to be used for experimental commercial fishing, research, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Sena-

tor from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) be listed as an additional cosponsor of S. 1163, the Area Redevelopment Act amendments which I and other Senators introduced on March 21, 1963, and that his name be added to the bill at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN SHIPPING CONTAINERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1342) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, that the name of the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. Bartlett) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H.R. 3872—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee plans to hold a hearing on the bill H.R. 3872, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The hearing will be held on May 17, 1963, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. All persons who wish to appear and testify on the bill are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 176

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that public hearings on S. 176 have been scheduled to begin at 10 a.m., on May 14, 1963, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

S. 176 would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement from the Federal service at age 55 after 30 years of service. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission will be heard first. Then others interested in the measure will be given an opportunity to testify.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 855 AND S. 915, DEALING WITH METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senate operating under the 3-minute rule?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That agreement does not violate the 3-minute rule, does it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on V-E Day, just 18 years ago today, we stood with trusted friends and allies, triumphant over the totalitarians who had laid waste much of the world in their attempt to dominate it.

When the Soviet Union reverted to its Marxist-Leninist policy of world conquest, we strengthened the old friendships and forged new ones, first under the Democratic administration of President Truman, and then under the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Many Americans had misjudged Soviet intentions during and immediately after the war, but through aid to and alliance with our friends abroad, we restored economic stability, built the NATO shield, and brought the Red bandwagon in Europe to a decisive halt.

Indeed, on the 15th anniversary of NATO, in 1960, we stood at a pinnacle of power and prestige. We were preeminent in the field of nuclear weapons—the myth of the missile gap did not even survive the present administration's first months. Our space effort, which had been ignored during the Truman administration, was beginning to make up the lost time. A series of alliances, supported by both of our great national parties, ringed our cold war enemies. We dealt with the Soviets, but in concert with our friends. And, our unyielding opposition to Communist oppression was clear.

In spite of this, there was a great deal of talk during the 1960 campaign about prestige and polls. A so-called decline in American prestige was made a prime issue by Democratic candidates. The then junior Senator from Massachusetts exhibited great concern when he told a Portland, Oreg., audience:

To rebuild American prestige will not be easy. It cannot be done overnight by a new administration. But I can assure you that a new administration will make the effort.

He told a Kansas City audience that the great challenge of "rebuilding our prestige" would require us to "understand the needs of other nations as well as our own."

He painted a grim picture. And it was all backed up by talk of mysterious and secret Government polls which purportedly indicated declining American prestige abroad.

Well, those and other polls are being used now, though under odd ground rules—one uses them when they prove his point, and abuses them when they do not.

As for our prestige, after 2 years of "rebuilding" the Russians are now in Cuba, where we have gone from eyeballs to elbows with them. This is the first time in modern history that an enemy of the United States has succeeded in

establishing a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. The creeping communization of Laos, otherwise known as Harri-man's folly, is opening a brand new door into Vietnam, where we are heavily committed. The policy of watchful waiting in the Middle East amounts to watching a tinder box that is already burning at one end and waiting for it to ignite at the other. And Indonesia's playboy potentate, Sukarno, goes his merry, extravagant, and anti-American way with our support. Such policies and events have not increased our prestige.

Even freedom's shield, NATO, is today, to use the currently fashionable phrase, "in disarray." One recent sequence in what the New Frontier describes as diplomacy illustrates this massive understatement of our European dilemma.

The administration's shock tactics with the British in abruptly canceling construction of the Skybolt missile, on which Britain has based her future nuclear deterrent, led to the hastily improvised Nassau agreement providing for British Polaris submarines. This confirmed General de Gaulle's suspicions about an Anglo-American "special relationship" and served as a trigger for his rejection of British entry into the Common Market. De Gaulle reportedly had hoped that Britain would pool her nuclear know-how with France.

And what was the administration's response to this ferment and confusion in the "New Europe" which it had done so much to jog into being? A missile-carrying freighter to be financed by all, and with mixed NATO crews, but with the U.S. finger on the firing button. Such a scheme is not what the Europeans really want; for, despite their participation, they will still have no control. It will add little to their defense or to ours. And yet these ships will be very expensive—estimates run as high as \$6 billion, a large portion to be paid by the German Federal Republic.

Former NATO Commander General Lauris Norstad has pointedly observed that "no matter how you tinker with the gadgetry of weapons" the heart of the problem "is the question of control."

It is time, I believe, that, in the President's words of 1960, we began to "understand the needs of other nations as well as our own." And, the best place to start would be with those nations who are our proven friends and allies. In short, we should recall that the NATO Alliance is just that, an alliance, and that we should treat it as such.

General Norstad has termed the European desire for a nuclear capability a "very legitimate desire." It seems to me that instead of deploring the fruits of our own successful investment—Europe's economic miracle—we should seek to help and influence those who, as committed Allies, should be in our corner if the horrible necessity for a resort to nuclear weapons should ever arise.

France's desire for an independent deterrent is a natural one, and one which will spread to other European nations in a disorderly and dangerous way if we do not move to influence, rather than to obstruct, the normal reach for security, nation by nation.

We already support a British deterrent.

Concern is sometimes voiced, by NATO countries and others, over West Germany's potential for a nuclear capability. Their scientists in this field are among the very best. To quote Harvard's Henry Kissinger, a noted expert on these matters who is frequently consulted by New Frontiersmen:

If West Germany is seriously interested in acquiring strategic weapons, the multi-lateral force (missile-carrying freighters) is apt only to prove an interim step and may turn out to be the easiest way of getting Germany into the nuclear business.

Is that what we want? Indeed, is that what the Germans want, a backdoor into potential disaster?

But this missile freighter idea is the closest discernible thing to a policy on this problem to emerge from that New Frontier combination of computer-managed-military-hardware-thinkers, abstract theorists, and spenders.

There is an alternative to this stop-gap gimmick, a constructive alternative. Instead of futile and negative efforts to discourage any European nuclear defense initiative outside of Britain, we could encourage an integrated, overall European force as a vital part of the drive toward unity and true Atlantic partnership.

I share the concern of those who are continuously vocal about the dangers of nuclear proliferation; of too many hands on too many nuclear triggers. But certainly a joint force combining the efforts, assets, and aims of the British, French, and other Europeans would be preferable to many separate independent nuclear forces. If we cannot relate our nuclear needs and strategies with theirs now, how can we expect to do so when the present seeds of nuclear proliferation really begin to sprout?

Looking back on V-E Day, of which this is the anniversary—looking back on the great prestige of the United States then—looking back on the grief and the breast beating, the public categorizing of our status in the world as sadly low and declining, during the last Presidential campaign, one finds now the true situation to be that a great leap backward in American prestige has taken place over the past 2 years. It will continue unless we face up to the difficult challenge of exercising positive and coherent leadership among equals, unless we recognize that the era which began on VE Day is closing, that great changes have been and are being wrought. We ought to move with the course of history, attempting to influence and mold it, rather than standing against it.

In Cuba, for example, in Laos, and elsewhere, a policy of wait and see usually ends up as wait and be shown.

Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military affairs expert of the New York Times, summed it up, I believe, when he wrote:

No alliance has room for second-best allies or discriminatory practices. A really coordinated multinational European nuclear deterrent, keyed to the two principles of collective European control without an American veto and a minimum deterrence, probably

offers the best hope for tomorrow. It is time to recognize that President de Gaulle has a point, to shift our emphasis to coordination rather than integration, and to attempt to influence, rather than to control, Europe's nuclear future.

Mr. President, we are now confronted with a Russian military presence in Cuba. An international brigade is being organized there—with the exporting of revolution from Castro Cuba presently and overtly underway, after the training of numerous cadres. And we are confronted by an administration which has deplored the very existence of any form of communism 90 miles from our shore and yet has complacently accepted not mere existence, not even mere coexistence, but the actual, thundering, ominous menace of foreign Communist armies, the very introduction of European systems condemned by the Monroe Doctrine. If the Monroe Doctrine is dead, in the administration's judgment, they should say so.

In my judgment, the answer is to assert our rights under the Monroe Doctrine, under the various declarations of Rio and Caracas, and under the statement of the Organization of American States of October 23, 1962.

Let us again, as Americans, be proud of and assert the facts that we know how to defend ourselves against communism, and again all other enemies, foreign or domestic; that we are prepared to defend ourselves; and substitute a policy which makes sense, that is in keeping with the desires of the American people, for the sad lack today of any foreign policy in relation to Cuba.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on this anniversary of V-E Day, I think we should look south of the border to the rest of Latin America, outside Cuba. Latin America was the one major part of the world that was not involved in or engulfed by World War II. But it has not escaped the tidal wave of the war's consequences. We thought that V-E Day marked the end of both the forces and philosophies of totalitarianism, but we were wrong. A particularly evil germ lay dormant, protected by a nominal participation in the forces of freedom; and since V-E Day, it has infected the bodies politic of many of the nations to the south of us. Unfortunately, we have not yet found the antibiotic that promises a cure.

We have tried words and phrases like "good neighbor policy" and "Alliance for Progress," as substitutes for the old homely remedy of the Monroe Doctrine. But the infection continues to spread. We know where the source is. It is in Castro's Cuba, and we have made several apparent attempts to eliminate it—notably at the Bay of Pigs and, last fall, on the "day of the missiles."

Both times when we prepared our friends to see surgery, they enthusiastically approved and supported us, and then we ended with aspirin. No wonder their faith in us is wavering.

In such a situation—and to change my metaphor—I am reminded of the lines of the poet, Pope:

Vice is a monster of so fierce a mien
That to be hated needs but to be seen
But seen too oft, familiar with its face
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

For the word "vice" in the poem, read the word "communism."

South American leaders live in a world of political insecurity. Their history, with its pattern of revolution, tells us that. They also live in an economic world whose pattern resembles pre-1917 Russia more than it does ours, an economic world with little or no middle class, and no widespread base of private capital available for investment in homes and jobs. The phoney promises of communism—the lure that hides the hook—sound good to them.

And yet they are proud, as we are, to be Americans. Those of their citizens who are not native are descendants of men who fled Europe, as our Founding Fathers did. Their tradition of law and government, with its roots in Rome, is different than ours, whose roots are in England, but the difference is less than between Europe and Asiatic Russia. I believe they want most of all to be like us, in personal opportunity and well-being. I think they would turn to communism only as a second choice, and in despair.

And yet they seem to be turning in that direction, or at least to be hedging their bets on American leadership—and increasingly so since 1961. Even the President of Mexico, who may not leave the country for more than 2 days without Mexican congressional permission, has made the pilgrimage to Moscow.

Where is the fault? With them? I think not. It must be with us. We must look within for the causes of failure. When we do we may discover these among others:

First. We have not tried to understand them, but rather to assume the arrogant posture of prescribing without diagnosis. The Great White Father knows best.

We went into Latin America with the Alliance for Progress before its details had been presented to the Congress.

Second. We have satisfied ourselves with catch phrases and Washington-centered programs, hoping that they would take the word for the deed—and when deeds have been inevitable, they have been weaker than the words that promised them.

Third. In the typical pattern of the New Frontier, every idea we come up with is based on the spending of money, including the ransom of the Cuban prisoners. Money is always a completely inadequate substitute for understanding and solutions based on human values.

Fourth. We never seem to be able to establish a satisfactory system of communication. Not only do we face a difference in language, but a difference in the meaning of words that are basic to an understanding of our goals. To them free enterprise is an evil concept, with the meanings of exploitation Marx attached to it over 100 years ago. To them social justice is the ultimate good, and Communists, not we, call themselves socialists.

V-E Day found us with the greatest power in the world, military as well as economic. Since then we have failed

in courage to use both. So who can blame the South Americans if they begin to shop around and take a look at communism? Unfortunately, that is exactly what they are now doing.

In the American tradition, the customer is always right. We must present the American system to our friends in Latin America more realistically, as though we were dealing in their interest, and not our own, and we must begin to live up to the promises we have so glibly made, realizing that time and confidence are slipping away from us very rapidly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, 18 years ago today at 2:41 a.m., the German armies surrendered unconditionally at Rheims, France.

It was a day for rejoicing. It was also a day of great sorrow for the cost in lives—for the suffering of men and women wounded and crippled from the fray. It was a day of mourning for those whose lives were laid down for liberty and for their families whose losses could never be repaid.

Out of this holocaust we emerged the mightiest Nation in the world. Our power and prestige were at a peak. The United States was looked upon not only as the savior of the free world, but as the protector and helper of all freedom-loving nations.

Now, 18 years later, where do we stand?

Mr. President, our foreign relations all over the world are in disarray. Our prestige is at a low ebb. Today we find Castro "home free" as puppet ruler of his apparently permanent Moscow supported Western Hemisphere Communist base. In Laos our situation is deteriorating every day, as a result of our agreement to accept a governing body that should be neutral, but is actually Communist.

In Berlin, in Latin America, in Korea, and in Africa—no matter where you go—our efforts have not made us friends, nor built our prestige.

In the continent of Africa, the political situation is most unstable. In many countries of Africa, our own money is supporting individuals and organizations that are bringing about chaos and instability.

President Kennedy, in seeking the Presidency, declared in a speech at Bowling Green, Ky., October 8, 1960:

First, we must ally ourselves with the rising tide of nationalism in Africa.

Second, we must make the United Nations the central instrument of our energies and policies in Africa.

Today, in the United Nations, we are barely holding our own against a burgeoning of new little African nations being born almost daily, many of which are smaller than our smallest states and with less population than some of our middle-size cities.

In Africa, many of these emerging nations are neither emerged nor are they nations. If we count Egypt and the Malagasy Republic among those African nations, there are 32 of them in the United Nations at present. Yet their

influence is as great as the number of votes they have.

Out of the 111 member nations in the United Nations, we, who shoulder the greatest burden, have but 1 vote. We find ourselves weighted in African votes 32 to 1 with even little Togo having the same vote as the United States.

Because Soviet Russia finds its greatest advantage by fishing in troubled waters, and because of the diversity of languages, tribes, and economies, we find that Africa is seething with all sorts of Communist activities and subversion. They are carrying on a campaign of hate, not only against each other, but also against the United States.

Despite official U.S. claims that "no new nation has gone Communist" both Mali and Ghana have declared their governments as the Soviet-type "socialist."

Guinea is cooperating with Soviet-bloc nations; and Ethiopia has been a center for Soviet espionage in Africa.

Mr. President, in making the United Nations the central instrument of our energies and policies in Africa, we found ourselves embroiled in a bloody civil war in the Congo. The list could go on and on.

We find ourselves called "imperialists" and worse by many of these tiny so-called African nations still engaged in bloody tribal warfare and drifting into the Communist orbit.

Today, in commemorating this anniversary of V-E Day, instead of a world in which we had the opportunity to lead to strength and freedom, and in which we did lead so that Europe is strong and prosperous in a world in which we freed of Japanese aggression those countries in the Far East who are now their own people, we find we have fewer friends than we ever had.

On V-E Day we realized that major problems can never be solved by appeasement. It is hoped that this principle is realized in the future.

Only by a firm and clear foreign policy can we hope to regain the prestige and respect which we had on that fateful day in Rheims when the once powerful German Army capitulated and the world dared to dream of a bright future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the eloquent and patriotic speakers who have preceded me. I must confess that, so far as Cuba is concerned, I cannot understand the shift of position in our policy. Last October I do not believe any of us would have believed that 6 months later the U.S. Navy and Air Force would be used for the protection of the Russian occupant of that island or the puppet government of Mr. Castro.

It is also beyond my understanding to fathom the purpose of our own Government, not only to use our own Armed Forces to protect the Russians, but also to send shiploads of food to feed them.

We have contributed 15 million pounds of Government-owned powdered milk for this purpose. We have also contributed 20 million pounds of vegetable oil. I understand that other articles of food,

which figured in the ransom deal, such as wheat, flour, potatoes, and possibly also a few luxury items, have been purchased with private or semiprivate funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are, in a way, taking inventory of the foreign policy of our Nation with respect to V-E Day. This is certainly a deeply moving day for all of us in the United States and, if we may be forgiven a little particularization especially for those of us who served in the Armed Forces of our country.

I should like to say a word about a particular area of the world, to which I have addressed myself recently.

I am as devoted to a bipartisan foreign policy affecting the Middle East, about which I would like to say a word today, as I am with respect to every other area of the world, and I trust that nothing which I shall say, even in the context of these remarks, which would betray my deep devotion to that fundamental approach.

However, I believe that it is the function of the opposition or the minority in respect to questions of foreign policy not merely to be quiet and close ranks, but to be fully informed about the facts upon which foreign policy decisions are made, and also to make its contribution—and often it could be a very marked and strong one—to the way in which that policy is administered and decisions are made, so that the impact may be had before grave damage is done to the national interests, rather than to seek political advantage after it is done.

It is in that spirit that I speak with respect to the Middle East. I think it is fair to say that this is one of the areas of the world which has caused considerable difficulty since V-E Day. It has been suggested that, perhaps the letters "VE" might be reversed so as to be "EV"—"eternal vigilance"—the price of the security of our Nation and our Nation's future.

In the Middle East I see certain directions of policy being pursued by the administration against which I called out the other day in a speech. I should like very much to include that speech within the context of constructive criticism; if you will, within the context of constructive criticism of the bipartisan policy on which I believe we are basing our action in the Middle East. I am not directing my criticism exclusively at this administration. I have had my difficulties in this regard with previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican. But, after all, the President is the President. He administers our foreign policy, and we must deal with the President who is presently in office. That is the sense in which I wish to be understood.

I believe we make a grave mistake in thinking that we can be "even-handed." Those are the words used by the Under Secretary of State in a letter sent to me and other Senators, explaining the posi-

tion of the administration with respect to the Middle East at this time and the grave dangers that amount to a war threat, including the accelerated arms race which it poses. I do not believe we can be even-handed in the Middle East between the aggressors and the defenders, between the oppressors and the oppressed. I do not believe we can be even-handed concerning an aggression of power under the leadership of President Nasser. Nasser threatens to use his power to destroy a state to whose preservation we are pledged—pledged by President Truman in his recognition of that state; by President Eisenhower in his support of that state; by Secretary Dulles in his declaration that our support of the State of Israel constitutes one of the tenets of American policy; and by the campaign pledge which President Kennedy undertook. I believe we are confronted with a fundamental mistake. When such a mistake is made, it manifests itself in ways which are most unwise. For example, we made a very great mistake in standing athwart a group of Arab-Asian nations which were seeking to have adopted in the United Nations a resolution calling for direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. I can hardly see how we could have taken that attitude in view of the policy of the President of the United States, who, when he was a candidate, speaking before a convention of the Zionists in New York City, said:

I propose that all the authority and prestige of the White House be used to call into conference the leaders of Israel and the Arab States.

Certainly, there was a chance to move to do that, but we did not do it; again, I believe, because of the mistaken idea that we can be even-handed between those who threaten aggression and liquidation and those who are defending themselves.

I think we see the same thing happening now in the way that foreign aid from the United States to President Nasser is being used to assist in the economics of the situation, and which unfortunately enables him to use Egypt's cotton crop for the purpose of buying Soviet-bloc arms, thereby jeopardizing peace and security in the area of the world especially secured to the State of Israel.

I believe we did the same thing again when we moved rather precipitately, in my judgment, to recognize the new regime in the Yemen. Incidentally, recognition was withheld by our great ally, the United Kingdom. But the United States recognized Yemen, notwithstanding the fact that the new government was maintained essentially by Egyptian troops shipped there by United Arab Republic President Nasser.

Again, enough problems have been raised for us by Syria and Iraq with the United Arab Republic, whose declared intention is the liquidation of Israel, and, therefore, with the consequence of bringing war to the Middle East, a war which would be bound to involve the great powers, as well.

So on the anniversary of the great V-E Day, as it focuses on the Middle East, I again pledge myself to a bipartisan foreign policy. I have laid on with equal

May 8

candor with respect to the administration in power, whatever may be its political obligation. The President has very heavy responsibilities. He is the man in authority. He is the man who is doing the work. Nevertheless, I believe we have made and are making some extremely grave mistakes in respect to our Mideast policy, and I believe it is my duty to point out, as well, what I consider to be appropriate solutions for them. I am trying to be true to that duty in the effort which I have described to call the attention of our people to what are the dangers—and I believe they are real dangers, as I have described them—amounting to a threat of war and, in my judgment, what needs to be done in order to avoid war.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an editorial entitled "Our Mideast Policy Under Fire," which appeared in the New York Post, May 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MIDEAST POLICY UNDER FIRE

The Kennedy administration is smarting under the harsh criticism of its Mideast policies voiced by a dozen Senators last Tuesday. The Senators, of both parties, assailed the administration for building up President Nasser while he continues to threaten the peace and stability of the Middle East.

In an indirect answer to its critics, the administration has let it be known that it recently took precautionary military measures and warned Nasser that we would intervene if there were a coup against King Hussein of Jordan. Washington also disclosed that it has been pressing the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and Syria to call off their propaganda war against Hussein.

But these disclosures only underline the contradictions in our policy. Who threatens Hussein? Who denounces Hussein as a U.S. puppet? It is President Nasser—the same Nasser who is a substantial beneficiary of U.S. aid and support.

It is a policy that makes little sense. Republican and Democratic Senators warned the administration that events in the area were now moving in a direction that can only end in war, a war that would endanger the peace of the world.

To halt this trend, they urged revival of the United States-British-French guarantees of the region's peace and stability, coupled with initiative to end the arms race.

If Nasser is unwilling to cooperate with a peace and stabilization program at a time when he is soliciting our help, what makes us think he will be more amenable later, when our help is less important?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now operating in the morning hour, or under the dispensation granted to the minority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now operating in the morning hour.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five additional minutes in which the Senator from New York will speak?

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to yield on this subject, and then to submit certain other matters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as there has been a concerted attack on the administration and on the Government over the past 18 years, I believe some Senator should respond to that criticism; and I hope that I may do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had thought the Senator from Montana would take the floor when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concluded. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Montana proceed now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, Mr. President; I should like to have all the diatribes and criticisms presented first.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to add to these remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I understood.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The Senate is now proceeding in the morning hour; and the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that 18 years after V-E Day we have had clear expositions in the Senate today of some of the problems that we are facing on a nationwide and worldwide basis.

LATIN AMERICA

The threat to the internal security of Latin America, and hence the entire Western Hemisphere, is greater today than at any time in history. Overlooking this fact, or pretending it will go away if ignored, is a policy fraught with danger which is doomed to absolute and final failure. As the most powerful nation in the hemisphere it is our responsibility to assume the lead of eradicating this menace. We have done this in the past and are expected by our Latin American friends to do it again.

During World War II, the United States, along with the Latin American nations, cooperated to prevent Axis penetration of the Western Hemisphere. In 1954, under the Eisenhower administration, a Communist-dominated government in Guatemala was overthrown with encouragement from the United States and the Central American nations after it began to receive heavy arms shipments from the Soviet Union. Firm action by the United States during the October Cuban crisis received unanimous and unqualified support from all members of the Organization of American States. The will is there. The need is there. The leadership of the United States cannot fail to be there.

The policy of the present administration on Latin America defies description. We are unable to see through the series of State Department smokescreens long enough to determine what, if anything, our Government is doing, or plans to do, with regard to Cuban exported subversion. That such subversion is going on, that saboteurs are being trained, equipped and sent to Latin American countries from Cuba is irrefutable. The

testimony of John A. McCone, Director of the CIA, makes this point clear.

Mr. McCone's testimony showed that between 1,000 and 1,500 Latin Americans received guerrilla and sabotage training in Cuba last year, and more have arrived this year. The CIA Director testified:

The Cuban effort at present is far more serious than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids that the bearded veterans of Sierra Maestra led into such Central American countries as Panama, Haiti, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic during the first 8 or 9 months Castro was in power.

Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

Mr. McCone has stated clearly that the nations of Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, and Panama are marked targets for this subversion by the Communists. Mr. McCone also indicated that Cuba furnishes money to buy weapons and other items necessary to conduct subversive activities.

By the end of March 1963, the President had both the proof of extensive Communist penetration in Latin America beyond Cuba, and evidence of growing alarm among our Latin American friends.

On April 15, 1963, President Kennedy attended a meeting of Central American Presidents in San José, Costa Rica. In spite of pressures by Central American Presidents, Mr. Kennedy did nothing to clear the issue of our policy toward subversion in Latin America.

In line with the strange things that are happening in Latin America are the questions being raised regarding the possible evacuation of the U.S. forces from Guantánamo Naval Base. Is the administration searching for a naval site in Puerto Rico as a prelude to such an evacuation? The Congress, the American people, and the freedom-loving Latin Americans have a right to know just what is being planned for Guantánamo.

The Latin Americans as well as citizens of the United States cannot help but be concerned over this administration's policy regarding Cuba. They cannot help but wonder whether the administration has a policy of assistance to Cubans to regain control of their own government or whether it intends to try to coexist with communism in this hemisphere while subversion and infiltration continue from Castro's Communist government in Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment my distinguished colleague from Colorado on the remarks he has made, and I join in them wholeheartedly. The Senator has performed a very valuable service in pointing out that all of us, as Americans, desire to support the President's policies in Latin America if we can. But first we need to know what those policies are. As Members of the Senate we have a right to have those policies defined for us. In that respect, the remarks of my colleague from Colorado have been very helpful. It is my hope that he will con-

1963

tinue, as I hope others will continue, to discuss that subject until we find out whether we have a policy and, if we do not have a policy, that we will start defining a policy for Cuba and Latin America.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the 18th anniversary of V-E Day, it is very appropriate that we turn our thoughts to that day 18 years ago when the great conflict in Europe ended. It marked the end of a 12-month campaign in which American soldiers and other members of the armed services, in conjunction with our allies, liberated Europe. These forces moved into Germany and Czechoslovakia and defeated the Nazi totalitarian regime.

There is much to consider today, as we still struggle with the consequences of that great war. We remind ourselves of history to afford light for today and the future.

I think that the judgment of history will be that the agreements which were made during that war—agreements which permitted the division in Berlin, which permitted the Soviet Union to move into Manchuria and ports along the Pacific—brought about the unhappy consequences with which we still must deal.

Despite the promises made by the Soviet Union, it broke them callously and fastened its control on every country it entered, except Austria and Iran. The Soviets agreed to the establishment of democratic governments in Poland and the Eastern European states, but proceeded to deny any democratic choice to the people of those countries.

That denial was followed by the blockade of Berlin, by the coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, and later by its open domination of Eastern Germany.

These events provided us with lessons which, unhappily, we have not recalled often enough. The Soviet Union has established its presence in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere, and I am fearful that, despite whatever promises the Soviet Union made last year, it will not withdraw its forces.

The question of Cuba troubles the country. What kind of policy shall we pursue, and what can be done? It is a difficult question to answer for the administration and for those who criticize its policy.

I believe that it ought to be our declared policy that the Soviet presence in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere cannot be accepted. I say quite honestly, it is difficult to implement this policy, but at least there should be a declaration that the ending of this presence is our policy—a declaration which will have meaning in our country, and which will have meaning in Latin America.

I believe the President should continue to insist that Khrushchev keep the promises he is said to have made last fall, at the time of the crisis, that Soviet

troops would be removed. And if there should be any attempt by the Soviet Union to take advantage of other situations which develop in Latin America—such as might develop in Haiti—our country should prevent, promptly, any further intrusion by Soviet forces.

I believe that the establishment of such a policy would clarify our purposes. It might not be possible to achieve its objectives immediately, but the establishment of the policy and the determination to continue to insist upon withdrawal of troops accompanied by other measures, even the resumption of the quarantine, in time, would I hope bring results.

I close by saying that on this anniversary of V-E Day it is best to remember the thousands who gave their lives during World War II.

It would be presumptuous for any of us, to recall our own experiences, but it is especially appropriate for all of us who had the opportunity to serve in World War II, and in Europe, to remember today the sacrifices of those who died, of those who were wounded, of those who suffered, and the sacrifices of their families.

I close my remarks by paying tribute to those who fought in World War II and who gave all that was asked of them, and more, for our country and for the preservation of freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an anniversary occasion is rather high ground in what can otherwise be a drab and routine existence. It gives one an opportunity to stand up a little higher, to look back to see from whence he came, and then to look ahead in the hope that the road is clearly demarked.

Today is the 18th anniversary of V-E Day.

Sometimes a journey can be described as a tour from one epochal event to another. Certainly the cessation of conflict and killing in a great sector of the world is an epochal event. I lived through it once, Mr. President. I lived through it on a battlefield on the Western Front in World War I.

People used to say about Lexington and Concord that the shot fired at the bridge was heard round the world. I can tell Senators that the stillness which comes in such sharp contrast can fairly be heard around the world.

So there was something eerie about the situation on the 8th of May, 18 years ago.

What a ghastly business it was, with the damage which was done to the ancient churches and cathedrals; to buildings and housing equipment, where men found a livelihood; to homes of all kinds; and, of course, the scars on the earth. All that suddenly came to an end. It was a bloody business, to say the least.

So when we stand on the pinnacle of an anniversary and look back and look around, we look forward, to try to assess the future and come to some kind of conclusion. Then one is lost in puzzlement and wonderment as to whether mankind learned a lesson or not.

I think of a great minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church

named Dr. Joseph Sizoo. It is worth recounting that his father came from Norway. He went to work for the Pullman Co. in South Chicago, when Abraham Lincoln's son was the president of the company. When the elder Sizoo got his first raise he put the money into a sequestered account for the education of his son, and that son was Dr. Joseph Sizoo, who long presided as the minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

I always thought it was one of the interesting postscripts of history that that is a church in which Lincoln attended prayer meetings—where, almost stealthily, he went on Wednesday nights through a side door, there to engage in the fellowship of prayer.

Dr. Joseph Sizoo found a larger ministry in New York. On Saturdays he used to go to the Veterans Hospital. One Saturday afternoon he was talking to a youngster there. He found that the patients had been "washed up" by the backlash of war. They were the wrecks, in large part.

He was talking about responsibility and social obligation, which came later, and in the middle of his discourse one particular youngster stood up. He had one arm shot off. The other arm was in a sling. He had a steel girdle around his middle, because a Japanese sniper had shot him in the spine on one of the islands of the Pacific. He would never walk again under his own power.

As he listened to Dr. Joseph Sizoo, he suddenly stood up, with agony on his face as if the chisel of Phideias himself had put it there, and said, "Padre, Padre, will anything come of it?"

That is a good question, Mr. President, 18 years after this deafening silence on the battlefields of Europe.

I was in Paris that day. I asked the commander of the Paris quarter to give me a car and a doughboy, and I went to Versailles, that great garden built by Louis XIV. The place was locked, and I wandered around, and I finally found a poilu with only one arm. We had something in common. He also had served in World War II.

In my limited French, I asked him how I could get in. Then I asked him, "Where is the Salle de la Guerre?"—the Salon of War, with all the magnificent oil paintings. Then I said to him, as we went into that room, "Where did Clemenceau sit?" He said, "Voila." I asked, "Where did President Wilson sit?" "Voila."

And then, at the end of one component of World War II, I was standing where the peace treaty was signed. I allowed myself to fall into something of a reverie. I thought, "Had we learned anything?" It seemed not, because more men were under arms. The methods and devices for killing were more efficient and expeditious. And a rather peculiar feeling possessed me.

Four months after V-E Day came V-J Day. A bomb brought a new age and a new era and the end of a war. Then we had an opportunity to think a little about what was taking place.

It is an astounding thing, Mr. President, that one of God's greatest blessings to mankind is grass, because it heals and covers the scars of the earth. How quickly the rubble is gone. Go out to the Ruhr or any place else in Germany or Austria. New buildings have risen, and the rubble has disappeared. Man's ingenuity and imagination have encompassed all that.

But, singularly enough, a nation, like Phoenix, can rise from the ashes of war and fairly rehabilitate its great physical plant, its shattered earth, and everything else; but, somehow, that healing has not reached the hearts and minds of mankind.

I had a very quaint experience the other day. I went to address a mass meeting of Republican women. My speech was taken down by a reporter using shorthand, and when she transcribed her notes, where I had spoken about the "balm of Gilead," she put in the words "balm of Gilead." What an amazing thing, then, that, somehow, the very atmosphere in which we live impresses itself in little ways, and the balm of Gilead seemed to be pretty far away.

I asked the distinguished majority leader to let us have this time, and he graciously consented, because I thought we ought to look back and observe this day and think a little about the problems of today, and also the circumstances and conditions that have evolved since that day 18 years ago when, in a delirium of jubilation, I thought I saw a million people in downtown Paris as the lights came on for the first time in years.

So we stand here on this pinnacle, and we look back, and then we look down, and then hopefully we look ahead. But as we look around, what do we see? Name any continent. Name any great area, and, Mr. President, you will see it on the front page.

If you name me Asia, Mr. President, I name you a divided Korea that cost us nearly \$20 billion a year, and is costing us every year. A parallel of latitude divides North Korea from South Korea.

Mr. President, you name me China, and I name you a great, hulking country, with perhaps 600 million people, under the tyranny of dictatorship driving their people down the Red road of communism.

Mr. President, you name me Thailand, once known as Siam, and I name you a country that is under the dynamics of fear. A part of our 7th Fleet is standing at the Gulf of Siam.

Mr. President, you name me Laos, where we finally assented to a troika government—Communist, neutral, and one for their own country—and I name you a country that is in grave jeopardy today of being overwhelmed and taken over by the Red ideological scourge.

Mr. President, you name me Burma, and I can recite you the agony of the acting Prime Minister when I was in Rangoon.

Mr. President, you name me Indonesia, which has been referred to on the floor today, and I name you a country which is seething with difficulty and which itself could become a victim of this virus.

This is 18 years after V-E Day and after men surrendered the ghost in the islands of the Pacific.

Mr. President, you name me Europe, and I name you a stone wall that separates East from West Berlin.

I name you France, which vetoed Britain's entry into the Common Market, and which evidently is seeking to develop a third force. I name you all the countries in Eastern Europe that are under the Red heel, and particularly a great country like Poland, which produced so much in culture, so many great musicians, artists, and the like. Today, for practical purposes, it is the victim of the virus that is in the atmosphere of the world today.

Mr. President, if you name me the Middle East, which has been discussed here today, one wonders if all the countries of Moslem extraction and Moslem base will finally consummate what they have in mind, and what will happen to the Republic of Israel, which was born and recognized in the Truman administration.

Mr. President, you name me Latin America, with its poverty and its wretchedness, and I name you a continent were the peasant league, evidently 2 million strong in the largest country there, is seeking, by might and main, to overwhelm the constituted authority and impose the imprimatur of communism.

Mr. President, you name me Cuba, and I name you a country that was liberated by American arms, sustained, and taken by the hand, until it obtained its own independence; and today it is under the heel of communism, and is the stooge of Khrushchev, 18 years after V-E Day.

So, Mr. President, you can name any hemisphere, any continent, most countries, and it will be seen that we are confronted with problems seemingly greater than those that were on our doorstep when we summoned the youth of America and our ingenuity to stop the rising tide of dictatorship. It is a tragic business, one that can bring only distress to human hearts.

One thing that bothers me more than anything else is the phrase that is creeping into our conversation. We no longer talk of the cold war. We seem to talk of a permanent cold war. That phrase recurs so many times that it insinuates itself into the thinking of the people, 18 years after the deafening silence brought the delirium of joy to millions of people in all corners of the world.

It is a day to be remembered. It is a day for rededication. It is a day for reconsecration to the purpose that makes this Republic the greatest country on the face of the earth, and sets in motion those divine forces in the mind and in the heart of the individual which are the great swelling motive power for American achievement and accomplishment.

How quickly we forget. The Senate has not observed the anniversary of this day during my service in this body. However, I think it is time to take account of some of the ancient landmarks that those before us have set, and to take account of the sacrifices they have made.

The word "sacrifice" has in it the connotation of something sacred. When a young man forfeits his life for his country, and when a million casualties—our casualties—are the result of conflict, we can afford in this deliberative body to take a little time to go into communion with ourselves and measure the cost of what we enjoy today.

One of the most pathetic and touching stories that I have ever heard was that of a young GI who, when last seen, was getting on a transport to go to one of the Pacific Islands. His commanding officer noted that when he last saw him alive he had in his breast pocket a little paperbacked book, the outside cover of which displayed the title "Our Hearts Were Young and Gay."

When his commanding officer saw him the next time he was upside down and covered with blood, and his blond hair was out over the sand. But the book was still in his pocket: "Our Hearts Were Young and Gay."

I helped to send these young men over there, by my vote, and I mean to remember it. I believe that Members of this exclusive legislative body, to which was committed the purse, while the Constitution was committing to the Commander in Chief the sword, must always remember that we cannot get into formal conflict without a vote of this body, and no dollars can be spent unless we appropriate them to send the flower of America out into the far reaches of the earth, to do battle—yes, and for what?

Sometimes we forget; but I have talked with many of them, in Germany, France, the Middle East, India, and the Far East. I have said to each of them, "Soldier, what do you think about? What is this all about? Why are you here?"

Almost invariably they become inarticulate and tongue-tied. Then I would get a kind of halting answer, which came not so much from the lips as from the heart, "Well, I guess it's for freedom."

What blessed beneficiaries we are of the great hordes who have gone before us. May we never cast aside one of the greatest attributes that God has conferred upon mankind, the attribute to remember.

This day, Mr. President, we remember.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been listening for at least an hour and a half to a series of speeches by my Republican colleagues in the Senate on a number of subjects which had very little, if any, relation to the observance of the 18th anniversary of V-E Day, marking the end of World War II in Europe.

During the course of these remarks, some of which were quite statesmanlike, such as that of the distinguished minority leader and that of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and others, I thought that due honor was being paid to the subject under consideration. However, some of my other Republican colleagues in the Senate mentioned V-E Day at the beginning of their remarks, and that was the last reference made to that historic occasion.

It seems to me that while this was a well-led and well-directed brigade, the arguments which were advanced to show

1963

that this country has enjoyed 18 years of misrule were very poorly documented. I heard such words as "inventory of our foreign policy" over the past 18 years. I heard such descriptions as "clear exposures" concerning foreign policy and our lack of it over the past 18 years. I heard references to Cuba, with Latin America thrown in incidentally. I heard fleeting references to Africa. I heard references to the Middle East, which I do not believe should be considered within the context of the "Charge of the Light Brigade" today, because they had to do with a resolution which was submitted.

Until the minority leader spoke, I heard no reference to the situation in southeast Asia; no reference to Formosa; no reference to Korea; no reference to Thailand; and I believe no reference to Laos. A good deal was overlooked in the course of these discussions, and much was left unsaid. Criticism was leveled against the policy of this Government over the past 18 years.

I did not hear mentioned once the name of General Eisenhower, the military leader of the Allied Forces on V-E Day. I did not hear mentioned once the name of former President Truman, who was in office at that time. I did not hear mentioned the name of the present President of the United States, who at that time was, I believe, a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, and who was fighting in the Pacific, doing what he could through personal courage to advance the security, welfare, and well-being of his country.

But I heard much criticism without any names being mentioned; and evidently it was criticism of the Government over the past 18 years. I should have hoped that our Republican colleagues would have given their own administration and our own country a better mark for what has occurred over the past 18 years than was given on the floor of the Senate today.

Who halted and reversed the Soviet threat in Iran? The U.S. Government. Who inaugurated the Greek-Turkish aid program and the Marshall plan? This Government—and, incidentally, in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. Who was responsible for lifting the Berlin blockade? This Government. Who instituted the Marshall plan, which renewed Europe and commenced the building of a powerful, friendly, democratic Germany? This Government. Even the power of President de Gaulle in Western affairs is a testimonial to a strong and vigorous France, a nation which was assisted from near ruin by our aid within the past 18 years. Who resisted communism successfully in Korea?

In all that time, our country has remained strong and able to meet such emergencies. Russia has added nothing to her direct territorial control since 1945, while our power has maintained a nuclear standoff.

Great problems still remain, but they are not solely the responsibility of either Democrats or Republicans; they are the responsibility of all Americans, regardless of party.

In accepting our responsibilities, however, we must recognize the limits of our ability to affect events around the globe. I think it is important that we avoid what D. W. Brogan calls "the illusion of omnipotence"—that American policy and power can reverse any unfortunate trend or repair any difficulty that occurs anywhere in the world.

President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy have all learned, if they did not already know, the truth of this situation.

I wonder why it is that on this sad and happy occasion—sad because of the lives lost; happy because of the end of a war—it has been necessary for the Republican light brigade to launch a series of attacks against what has occurred in our own country over the past 18 years.

What do they mean when they speak of "surgery" as being needed? I do not know. Are we being accused of "losing" Cuba and possibly Haiti? Are we being accused of, or commended for, "saving" the Dominican Republic and Guatemala?

Are we Republicans and Democrats first, and Americans last? Or are we Americans first and members of two great political parties second? Are we politicians first and Americans last? I urge Senators to consider some of the statements which we make.

Over the years since V-E Day, the United States, under Republican and Democratic administrations, have been accused on the floor of the Senate of continual failure. I have heard no alternatives offered; but I have listened to criticisms of what was being done and of what was not being done. I have heard no Senator advocate that an embargo be imposed on Cuba. An embargo is an act of war. I have heard no Senator urge today that the United States should invade Cuba. I have heard much criticism, generally speaking, but I have heard nothing in the way of specifics. The easiest thing a politician can do is to find fault, without offering constructive alternatives. Not one constructive alternative or suggestion has been made on the floor of the Senate today.

I have heard criticism of our Government and of our policies over the past 18 years; criticism of our sacrifices over the past 18 years; criticism of our leadership over the past 18 years.

All of us, regardless of party, should examine a map of the world. Look at Vietnam, where today we have 12,000 men stationed—"advisers," as they are called. Recall that the 7th Fleet is in not only the Straits of Taiwan but in the South China Sea and the Gulf of Siam, as well. Look at Korea, where two American divisions are still stationed, and where I am afraid they will be stationed for a long time to come, because there is no peace in Korea—only a continuation of an uneasy truce.

When we look at the rest of Latin America outside the Caribbean we can hardly find a single country which is stable today. Consider Cuba and Haiti, where anything may happen. Consider the Dominican Republic. What do we see? We see trouble, real or potential.

What about our relations with Western Europe? What about our relations

with the newly emerging countries in Africa? What about the situation in the Middle East, where the perennial Israeli-Arab conflict is blossoming again, potentially dangerous?

I suggest that Senators ask themselves one question about the man and the Government whom they so freely criticize: What would I do if I were in his shoes and had to make the decisions which only he can make?

If we ask ourselves that question, we will have a pretty good idea of the great responsibility which is his, and his alone, not because he is the head of the Democratic Party, but because he is the President of the United States, and as such represents all the people of this country.

REDESIGNATION OF BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 138) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, established by Executive Order Numbered 1216 of June 23, 1910, and enlarged by Proclamation Numbered 2389 of June 29, 1939, is hereby redesignated as the Big Hole National Battlefield.

Sec. 2. In order to preserve historic features and sites associated with the Battle of the Big Hole and to facilitate their administration and interpretation, the boundaries of the Big Hole National Battlefield are hereby revised to include the following described lands:

MONTANA PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 2 south, range 17, west: Section 13, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 23, east half northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 24, west half east half, north half southwest quarter; southeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 25, those portions of the northeast quarter northwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter lying north of the north right-of-way line of relocated Montana State Route 43; consisting of approximately 466 acres.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) Any lands described in section 2 of this Act that are a part of the Beaverhead National Forest when this Act takes effect are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Big Hole National Battlefield.

(c) Lands included in the Big Hole National Battlefield pursuant to this Act shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-3), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 4. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana, effective when accepted by said State in accordance with its laws, such jurisdiction as has been ceded by such State to the United States over any lands within the boundaries of the Big Hole National

May 8

Battlefield reserving in the United States, however, concurrent legislative jurisdiction over such lands.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not exceeding \$20,000 as are necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be continued for the next 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a matter, which may have almost as important a bearing on the welfare of the country as the solution—if we find one—to some of our foreign entanglements.

On May 21 a vote will be taken by the wheat growers of this country as to whether they will accept a program, and the controls connected with it, which were promoted last year and approved last year, for future application, or whether they will reject the program.

A vigorous controversy is now in progress as to whether the Department of Agriculture is putting forth an intensive propaganda effort to secure a "yes" vote in the referendum. Probably the methods used by the administration may be of as much concern to us as the outcome of the wheat referendum itself. I believe that we had better let the facts speak for themselves. Therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the close of my remarks a document which has been sent out to wheat growers. The one I have comes to me from the Labette ASCS county office, at Altamont, Kans. I understand that documents similar to this one have been sent out to wheat growers all over the United States.

The document purports to show that if the wheat grower who is raising 40 acres of wheat votes "yes," he will receive \$1,805.06 for his crop; whereas, if he votes "no," he will receive \$1,014.20 for his crop.

It seems to me that the administration is proceeding on three or four false assumptions in regard to the forthcoming wheat referendum vote.

First. It seems to assume that the American farmer, particularly the wheat farmer, is gullible, and will believe almost anything that the Department of Agriculture sends to him through the mails.

Second. It seems to assume that the American farmer is a greedy person who will gladly give up controls over his own business in order to have a temporary increase in income.

Third. The administration assumes that the American farmer is a timid person, who will fall on his face if he is threatened with any loss of income.

The fourth assumption seems to be that if the wheat farmer votes against a program desired by the administration, the President and Congress will punish him by not enacting legislation which will give a fair recompense for his crop.

I believe that the administration in this case would do much better if it were to busy itself with studying the real character of the American farmer, rather than proceeding under these several false assumptions.

Besides receiving copies of this document from Kansas, I have received them also from Colorado and other States.

There is no question about the fact that at least 1 million copies of the document have been distributed to the wheat growers of the country. I believe all of them have received copies of this document. We know that the Department of Agriculture is very busy trying to pick up new votes. That might be very helpful in the forthcoming referendum. Also, there have been some very interesting meetings throughout the country for the purpose of explaining the new wheat program. If it were explained impartially, I would have no objection, but I will leave it to the readers of this document to decide for themselves whether the administration is impartial in this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the document be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE, LABETTE
ASCS COUNTY OFFICE.

Altamont, Kans., May 3, 1963.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FARMER: Are you ready to decide on 1964 wheat? Yes, \$1.90; no, \$1.10.*

May 21 is coming soon.

Producers who have an interest in a 1964 farm wheat acreage allotment are eligible to vote. This includes:

1. Landowners who receive all or a share of the wheat crop or proceeds thereof. Both husband and wife can vote if both names are on the farm deed.

2. Tenants or sharecroppers who receive a share of the wheat crop or proceeds thereof. Both husband and wife can vote if—

(a) Both names are on the lease; or
(b) A verbal lease applies and the county committee determines that both are responsible for carrying out the tenant obligations under the lease.

The eligibility of the wife to vote should be established with the ASC County Committee before May 21.

If you live outside the county, or you will be out of the county on May 21, you can secure the ballot by signing and returning the enclosed request for an absentee ballot.

Special step to take by May 13:

1. If your farm acreage allotment is 14.0 acres or less, the operator must sign on the back of the allotment notice by May 13 and

* Warehouse stored, \$1.90; \$2 farm stored.

* Warehouse stored, \$1.10; \$1.20 farm stored.

get this to the ASCS office. This signature will make landowner and tenant eligible to vote and eligible to participate and obtain price support, wheat certificate, and diversion payments.

TIME IS SHORT

Are you in favor of marketing quotas for wheat for the 1964 crop? Yes —. No —.

What a "yes" or a "no" vote can mean to you based on estimated 1964 wheat loan rates for warehouse stored grain:

LABETTE COUNTY

A "yes" vote means:

1. \$2.03 per bushel price support warehouse stored rate on certificate wheat—80 percent of normal production—\$1.33 on non-certificate wheat.

2. Assuming a 40-acre 1963 allotment and 36 acres for 1964: 36 acres times 25.6 bushels normal yield equals 922 bushels.

3. Eighty percent certificate wheat equals 737.6 bushels at \$2.03 per bushel equals \$1,497.33.

4. Other sale or use: 184.4 bushels feed, seed, or price support of \$1.33 equals \$245.25.

5. Four acres diverted at \$15.62 per acre equals \$62.48 diversion payment.

6. Total \$1,497.33 plus \$245.25 plus \$62.48 equal \$1,805.06.

You can substitute date for your own farm.

A "no" vote means:

1. About \$1.10 per bushel price support warehouse stored rate if within allotment. Market price estimated \$1 per bushel or —.

2. Assuming a 40-acre 1963 allotment and 36 acres for 1964: 36 acres times 25.6 bushels normal yield equals 922 bushels.

3. \$0 certificate wheat.

4. Other sale or use: 922 bushels at \$1.10 price support equals \$1,014.20. If seeded above allotment like 50 acres times 25.6 bushels equals 1,280 bushels at \$1 equals \$1,280.

5. \$0 diversion payment.

6. Total \$1,014.20 or \$1,280.00?*

GEO. W. MARVELE,
Labette ASC County Committee.
Postage and fees paid U.S. Department of Agriculture.

DAR GOOD CITIZENSHIP AWARD TO MISS KATHLEEN BARDEN OF LITTLE ROCK

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 18 at Constitution Hall here in Washington, a very talented and extremely capable young lady from Little Rock, Ark., Miss Kathleen Barden, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. J. Barden of 8 Kavanaugh Place, was awarded the National DAR Good Citizenship Award for 1963, together with the \$1,000 scholarship that accompanies the award.

Miss Barden achieved this high honor in competition with 10,869 senior girls in accredited high schools throughout the Nation. Judging for the award was based on outstanding qualities of dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism.

The Arkansas award winner will use her \$1,000 scholarship to attend the University of Arkansas, where she plans to study either to become a teacher or to pursue some other vocation in the field of Christian education. Miss Barden is an outstanding example of the fine young people in our State and of the high call-

* Cost of production would increase due to planting additional 14 acres.

Castro's Moscow Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev is now confident that he has won the battle for Cuba and it is safely behind the Iron Curtain. The invitation to Castro to visit Moscow, the joint insulting statements directed toward the United States, all were intended to demonstrate that Cuba now belongs to Khrushchev and, that as far as the Communists are concerned, the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

The failure of President Kennedy to take a firm stand against Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere; his refusal to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, his acceptance of Soviet terms on keeping Russian arms and soldiers in Cuba, gave Khrushchev this victory.

We can seize the initiative again in ridding this hemisphere of Communist subversion, but only if the President will demonstrate courage and support the demand of the American people to put the security of the United States ahead of his fears and frustrations. The Monroe Doctrine must be reinstated, the Communists driven out of Cuba and that country returned to its people. If the President is unable or unwilling to be the true leader of the United States, he should so state before it is too late.

The propaganda victory President Kennedy has given to Khrushchev through mishandling the Cuban situation is told in the following article from the U.S. News & World Report of May 13:

WHEN KHRUSHCHEV AND CASTRO GET TOGETHER—WHAT THE MOSCOW MEETING MEANS

Fidel Castro, by his state visit to Moscow, has made formal the position of Cuba as Russia's first satellite in the Western Hemisphere.

Castro traveled abroad, confident of his position at home. He had public assurance against any move by his neighbor, the United States, to cause him trouble at this time. The United States, too, was acting to keep in check anti-Castro Cubans.

It is clear that Khrushchev shared Castro's confidence. Soviet experts say Khrushchev wouldn't have risked his own prestige by having Castro in Moscow if he thought there were any possibility of imminent trouble in Cuba.

Castro was communism's May Day hero in Moscow. But there was more to the trip than public display.

When Khrushchev and Castro got together in the Soviet Union, their objectives were described as varied:

By meeting, the two leaders of Communist states advertised their confidence that they can carry forward an anti-U.S. operation unmolested, right under the nose of the United States. Soviet diplomats proclaimed the death of the Monroe Doctrine shortly after Castro landed in Russia.

There was the opportunity to explore openings and programs to promote communism more aggressively in the countries of Latin America.

Castro was able, at first hand, to sell Khrushchev and others in the Communist hier-

archy on the benefits that could flow to them from stepped-up aid to Cuba in armament, food merchandise, and equipment of many kinds.

Khrushchev, for his part, gained an opportunity to seek assurances from Castro that Russian guidance would be accepted to a greater degree in trying to bring some order out of economic chaos on the island. It is known that many top Communists are concerned because what they had hoped to make a show window of Communist success in the Western Hemisphere looks more like a junk heap under Castro.

The Russians, too, by honoring Castro, sought from him a commitment that he would go along with the Soviet Union and avoid ties with Red China on issues that are dividing world communism.

Both men saw the trip as a blow to U.S. prestige in all of Latin America.

THE INVITATION

It seems agreed that initiative for the meeting came from Moscow. There had been a long-standing, generalized invitation to Castro to visit the Soviet Union, but it was vague in terms of time.

There are signs that, when the trip did come, it was planned in a hurry. The purpose may have been to forestall a gesture by Castro that would be regarded as favorable to Red China. Castro could be displayed in Moscow as the symbol of Soviet Russia's first territorial gain since the years just after World War II—and the first such gain under Khrushchev.

In Russia, Cuba is now dealt with as a full-fledged Soviet satellite. In greeting Castro, the Soviet dictator described the bearded Cuban as "the envoy of the first Socialist revolution on the American Continent."

Cuba, as a satellite, is listed in alphabetical order among the Communist-bloc nations. The Communist May Day slogan for Cuba is similar in phrasing with those of other satellites—worded to a pattern made in Moscow.

The Russians seem confident that their American satellite is nailed down. But there is evidence that they are not altogether happy with the way Castro is operating that satellite.

The Communist empire is supplying Cuba with aid that amounts to about \$1 million a day. They are pouring in petroleum, meat, rice, fats and oils, steel, wire, tractors, buses, road machinery, and many other things.

Khrushchev has had to tap his European satellites for materials to keep Cuba operating. Czechoslovakia, in particular, is providing a substantial share of this aid—and the Czechoslovaks are publicly grumbling about the burden they bear and about the inefficiencies of Castro and those about him.

SUGAR SHORTAGE

In spite of all the help that Castro is getting, the economy of Cuba appears to be running steadily downhill. Cuba's total output is down 25 percent from what it was 3 years ago, and is still declining. Estimates are that the main trading crop—sugar—will be less than 4 million tons this year. That is just about half what it was in the best years before Castro came to power.

Living standards for larger and larger sections of the Cuban population are dropping steadily. Letters from Cubans to refugees in the United States increasingly plead for shoes, medicine, clothing, food, and other necessities.

Castro needs more help than he is getting. The price he may have to pay is to grant Moscow closer supervision of Cuban affairs so more efficient use can be made of the aid the Soviet Union is willing to supply.

Castro has been a troublesome character for the Russians to deal with right along, as Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan reported

last year after his visit to Cuba. Castro is unstable and volatile, and not dependable from the Kremlin viewpoint. It seems clear to experts on Soviet affairs that Khrushchev decided the time had come to summon Castro to Moscow and give him a talking to.

More than just the plight of Cuba is involved in the visit. Communist politics at the highest level enter in.

Official experts in Britain who study such things say the Castro trip is a major move in the mounting competition between Russia and Red China for Communist leadership.

According to these experts, the side that gets Castro's active cooperation will gain a decisive advantage in Latin America. Since Khrushchev announced the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba last autumn, Castro has been flirting politically with the Chinese Reds.

Khrushchev may have called Castro to Moscow suddenly because he got word that Castro had scheduled a high-level meeting with the Chinese Communists for later this month. With Castro's cooperation, the Chinese Reds have been preparing to make a major bid for the allegiance of all Communist parties in Latin America.

The Kremlin, already worried by Chinese successes in the Communist Parties of Asia and Africa, considers it of prime importance to block such gains in Latin America. And the experts say the Castro trip may accomplish that Khrushchev can point out to Castro that China is doing next to nothing for Cuba, while Russia is doing a great deal, and at considerable financial sacrifice.

Specifically, it is believed that Khrushchev wants Castro to drop his plans for a conference in Havana of representatives from underdeveloped countries around the world. The Red Chinese, who induced the Cubans to propose this meeting, have been counting on it as a way to establish a foothold among Latin America's Communists.

Castro is known to be anxious to stay on good terms with both the Russian and Chinese Communists. There has been speculation in Britain, and among some U.S. experts, that he might visit Peking in an effort to keep himself balanced between the two Communist factions.

But talk of such a visit has been generally discounted, for several reasons, since Castro showed up in Moscow.

For one thing, the Chinese under present circumstances are thought to be unwilling to play second fiddle to Khrushchev as hosts to Castro. Another point is that Castro, needing more economic props from Moscow, wouldn't go to China without Khrushchev's approval—which he is not likely to get.

PRICE TAG ON CASTRO

What price is Khrushchev prepared to pay for Castro's help in the power struggle within communism?

American experts disagree, but British officials believe Khrushchev is prepared to promise to keep Soviet troops in Cuba indefinitely—or, at a minimum, until Cubans can be thoroughly trained in the handling of their Soviet weapons.

The logic in this reasoning is that the withdrawal of Soviet missiles and bombers from Cuba has left Castro uncertain as to just how solid are Russian military intentions in the Western Hemisphere. As a means of reassuring Castro, some experts would not be surprised to see the Moscow trip produce a mutual-defense pact between Cuba and the Soviet Union.

If that happens, it will be Russia's first formal military alliance in the Americas—and will raise anew the question of when and where the Monroe Doctrine applies. That doctrine is a U.S. pledge—now broadened to include the backing of the Organization of American States—to prevent the establishment of any foreign system of government in the Western Hemisphere.

American Revolution, summarize our present world situation.

Man—with his great achievements, his staggering scientific discoveries—yet faces the threat of annihilation.

AT EXPENSE OF OLD FRIENDSHIPS

The State Department and indeed the United Nations are obviously trying at the expense of old friendships to be popular with new nations.

The United States is friendlier toward India than towards her victim, Portugal. And this in spite of the fact that India ignored the right of the people of Goa to self-determination, and that Portugal is a small nation compared to India—and that our bases in the Azores came up for renegotiation last January.

The Dutch, the Belgians, the French, the Portuguese, and the British do not enjoy our doctrinaire, somewhat sanctimonious, anti-colonial attitude, especially since we don't often talk about the Russian colonies—the greatest and most tyrannical colonial empire in the history of man. Yet we joined Russia in demanding that the U.N. investigate Portuguese Angola.

Last summer, while on active naval duty with the 7th Fleet in the Far East, I had opportunity to observe the dark clouds charging down upon us.

Among our friends and allies there is considerable dismay regarding the drift in our foreign affairs.

CONCESSIONS ENCOURAGE SOVIET "MATURITY"

To suggest, as the administration has repeatedly suggested, that the Soviet Union is maturing, and that concessions will encourage further maturity, is a naive and egregious error. This struggle in 1963 is just as intense, the threat just as menacing, as at any time in the past 17 years.

The theory that Khrushchev represents an evolution, that the Soviet Union is not only at odds with Chinese communism but is moving toward modification and moderation, is a dangerous illusion.

SAME STORY ALL OVER AGAIN

This whole concept is the same story all over again. Russia has a capacity for putting it over which is almost incredible and some have an equally incredible capacity for accepting what Russia is propagating.

In 1961, 3,600 million pieces of Soviet literature inundated us and our friends and allies. We facilitate this in the United States by free postage, decreed by the President. We are paying for it.

Russia is weaker than we are, she has no real internal unity, she is saddled with a colonial empire that detests her, and yet she gains position after position.

It is a catastrophe that we of the Western World should be so drugged with half-truths and distortions, and that public support has not been mobilized to a realization of the imminent and inplacable danger.

KHRUSHCHEV LOST FACE BUT GAINED OBJECTIVE

In Cuba, following the disaster at the Bay of Pigs, the obscene Communist dictator Castro has, assisted by his Communist allies and in spite of our brief action last October, built a fortress where tanks, Russian migs, heavy artillery, arms, supplies, and mercenaries in large numbers, constitute an increasing threat 90 miles from our shore.

While Khrushchev temporarily lost face, he has effectively accomplished his objective—not to destroy the United States by nuclear force, but to protect his conquest of Cuba and to help him conquer other nations in our hemisphere.

RED CONQUEST BY GUERRILLA WAR

The fact is that the many millions of people who since World War II have been subjugated by the Communist tyranny have been defeated in no case by nuclear attack and in no case by the contagion of the Communist doctrine.

They have been conquered by guerrilla warfare, a kind of warfare which our gallant Spanish friends understand well. They've been conquered by infiltration and subversion, by blackmail or coercion and bribery, by external pressure and internal force—and we Americans must learn to operate effectively in this twilight zone of action in which the Communists excel. We must also concentrate more on conventional forces (as General Norstad recently pointed out) in order not to be confronted with an all-or-nothing choice.

In Berlin there is a precarious standoff which could be turned against us by reckless and timid miscalculations, such as occurred in the Bay of Pigs. The ransom to liberate 1,113 Cuban heroes certainly appeal to our sense of humanity and brotherhood. Yet, their freedom was obtained by helping our enemy materially and psychologically.

Certainly we had an obligation but the honorable way to rescue them was to help them to carry out their original noble objectives—to rescue—not bribe them.

In Laos, the troyka coalition government, endorsed at Geneva and organized by the United States, as I said last summer, has done nothing to prevent Communist infiltration—and indeed helped bring the leftists to a controlling position.

The Communist Viet Cong terrorists have warned there can be no peace in Laos while war is being waged in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam we are heading toward a second Dien Bien Phu some 10 years later, an American version. I think we should make an allout effort to win, or withdraw.

We gave leftist Cambodia economic aid in spite of Thailand's objection. Thailand is pro-Western.

The Prime Minister of Singapore says either there will be a Malaysia quickly or the Communists will take over his city-state and the rest of southeast Asia.

The Indonesian leader Sukarno, having gained West New Guinea, is now threatening North Borneo, Brunei, and Sarawak. The Russians have given Sukarno \$1,400 million military and economic aid.

The United States encouraged transfer of West New Guinea from the Dutch to Sukarno, although there is no relationship between the Papuas and the Indonesians. The Indonesians have acted like old-fashioned imperialists.

REDS WINNING SOUTHEAST ASIA

The President of the Philippines stated last year that the Communists were winning southeast Asia. The situation is much worse now.

In the field of diplomacy our pattern of what is called "flexibility" against the Communist threat has produced discouragement and lack of confidence among our friends—and few discernible results favorable to our cause. Perhaps we should be more flexible toward our partners—less flexible toward our enemies.

We might consider whether it might be better to be firm in Berlin—rather against pro-Western Tsombe in the Congo.

Perhaps we should be more indignant against the Russian imperialists in their brutal assault against freedom fighters in their colony Hungary than over the fact that our NATO partner Portugal is determined to resist the Communist-inspired attack against the people of Angola.

Instead of waxing resentment over the fact that General Franco, who has since 1953 cooperated fully with the United States, still rules Spain—prosperous Spain—perhaps it would be better to dwell on the monstrous fiasco of the invasion of Cuba and on the monstrous fact that a Communist dictator threatens us in our entire hemisphere.

UNITE RATHER THAN REFORM

We have stated officially we have no desire to reform our enemies. Let us not then attempt to reform our friends. Let us try to unite rather than to reform.

It is not too late to take effective action, but it will take time. Let us be as resourceful in thinking up reasons why it is to our interest and the entire free world to act as we are in thinking up reasons why it is not.

Let us hope that our leaders in Washington will at long last understand that peace is the product of strength, that war is the result of weakness, and that appeasement merely multiplies the hazards of war.

Castro has taught us a bitter lesson: That he who proclaims himself a Communist can count on help from the Soviet Union—even though he is 9,000 miles away—and he who proclaims himself a lover of freedom can fight and die 90 miles from the shores of the United States—and no one will come to his aid. And now we are helping to make the Caribbean physically safe for the Communists.

U.S. POWER IMMOBILIZED?

Americans are in South Vietnam, just as Russians are in Cuba, yet no orders have gone out to prevent Viet Cong attacks on American soldiers. Russian officers are present in Laos, as advisers to the Red side. Khrushchev may well convince himself that American fear of a confrontation will immobilize American power in Laos as it has in the Caribbean.

Winston Churchill summed it up for us, as he has many times. He said:

"Still if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory can be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance to survive. There may even be a worse case: You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory and it will be better to perish than to live in slavery."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (R. Cathcart): "Will Franco survive wave of strikes predicted for summer?"

Answer. Strikes in Spain have been small compared to United States. Spain is very stable, with practically no juvenile delinquency, low crime rate, low suicide rate. Recent strikes were handled with moderation on both sides and I hope that will be the case this summer.

Question (William J. Ebert): "How does Junior Achievement plan to overcome Communist threat at home?"

Answer. The only way it meets the Communist threat is that young people, forming their own corporations under advice of professional businessmen, learn about the free enterprise system by their own experience; manufacture and sell their own products. Polled, 91 percent of Junior Achievement youth were against state taking over business. This contrasted with much lower percentage by those not enrolled in Junior Achievement. This itself leads to healthy dislike of communism and its methods.

Question (Howard C. Ellis): "What is actual condition of Red China militarily and economically?"

Answer. It would be mistake to conclude because she is in bad shape economically, she cannot wage war. We should give as much aid as we can to Nationalists. I was at Quemoy last year while on naval duty. If I were an enemy, I'd hate to have to make a landing there.

Question (W. M. Strother): "Prospects of getting communism out of Cuba?"

Answer. All sorts of things could have been done, still could be, but it is getting more difficult every day. Prospects are good if we decide what we ought to do and do it.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

1963

Specialists in Soviet affairs—both British and American—do not expect Khrushchev to support or encourage Castro in any action to try to force the United States out of its Guantánamo naval base in Cuba.

They say the Soviet leader knows that the United States, if provoked, could overthrow the Communist regime in Cuba by military action. They also say that, should military force be used, Khrushchev would scream about U.S. aggression, and might even harass the Americans in Berlin—but that he is not willing to risk a war to save Castro.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 and 8, the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station at New Haven marks the 75th anniversary of work in two important fields of science that have contributed greatly to this Nation's eminence in farm technology and its steadily advancing standards of living. The areas of scientific work to be commemorated are botany and plant pathology.

Scientists from numerous States, Canada, Great Britain, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have gathered at New Haven to present papers and take part in discussions on topics such as the history of plant pathology, biochemical resistance, and plant chemotherapy.

They were welcomed on May 7 by Director James G. Horsfall, himself an internationally recognized plant pathologist.

I am pleased to represent the district which includes this pioneer station. Its accomplishments are legion, and I would like to take this opportunity to mention briefly a few of its many notable achievements.

The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station is the oldest such station in the United States. Since 1875, its business has been and continues to be the scientific investigation of agriculture's problems and related ones. Its product has been and continues to be discovery in the biological sciences.

The Connecticut station's first director was Dr. Samuel W. Johnson. He fathered the idea on which the American experiment station movement was founded and succeeded. This was "that an experiment station should be near to but not a part of an academy." Johnson had a unique combination of scholarship, ability as a writer and speaker, and missionary zeal for the principle that knowledge needs to be sought before it can be taught. He was one of the active leaders in bringing about establishment of the State agricultural experiment stations under the Federal Hatch Act of 1887, 13 years after Connecticut's "first station in the Nation" was founded.

In 1868, he published "How Crops Grow," a book described at the time of his death in 1909 as more widely read and studied than any other work on agri-

cultural chemistry ever issued. It was translated into German, Russian, Swedish, and Italian, and used as a textbook in those languages. It was followed in 1870 by a second book, "How Crops Feed."

It was, therefore, a fitting tribute when the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station on March 29 announced a series of annual lectures named for its first director, Samuel W. Johnson. The first lecture in the series will be given by an internationally known speaker as the principal address at the annual "Science at Work" meeting, to be held at Lockwood Farm, Mount Carmel, on Wednesday, August 14.

A leaflet issued last year, "The Connecticut Station Story," tells of outstanding accomplishments at the station during its first 75 years. Among them was the corn seed production technique first used by Donald F. Jones in 1917. He invented the four-way cross that made hybrid corn practical. Protein investigations by Thomas B. Osborne led to the discovery of the significance of amino acids in the diet. The Morgan universal extractant, simulating the action of plant roots in removing minerals from the soil solution, made possible the widely used Morgan method for quick-testing soils. The zineb fungicides had their origin in research at the Connecticut station, and organic fungicides generally are originally tested by methods or modifications of methods the station developed. Station research made the tobacco shade tent practical in 1900, thereby creating a new agricultural industry in the Connecticut Valley.

In his report to Gov. John N. Dempsey in 1961, Director James G. Horsfall most ably defined the purpose and nature of the work done by the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station—and by those established subsequently in all the other States—in the following words:

This station was established as a unique venture of government in 1875. It was to discover knowledge and put it to work. The station is unique today among agencies of government whose reports are included in this digest.

It is true that the statutes assign to the station specific duties, duties that in themselves have little to do with scientific investigations. In this respect the station is like other departments of State government. The station has been given these assignments, however, because they call for the skills and knowledge the station has in putting science to work.

The general mandate, however, the responsibility for science, does not involve execution of manmade laws. It asks rather for discovery of natural laws and meanings of laws, and for information on their application now and in the future. We do not know why these laws came into being, or where, or when, and we are unlikely to find answers to these questions. We do know that natural laws cannot be evaded or repealed. Through organized research, men have made a bold beginning at the gigantic task of understanding how some of these laws work and how the knowledge gained can be used.

I congratulate the station on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, and I am sure that my colleagues in this House will join me in thanking the station and its most able director for its outstanding record of accomplishment and scientific contribution.

Taxes, Spending, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the chamber of commerce here in Washington, D.C., on the importance of a tax reduction this year.

His remarks explain succinctly the causes of our economy's lack of growth. They set forth the President's tax program as the best means of overcoming this chronic problem. It may serve as an example to those who endeavor to find common grounds for supporting this legislation.

Secretary Dillon's address merits the attention of this body, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I am including his address.

The address follows:

TAXES, SPENDING, AND FREEDOM

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 30, 1963)

For the second general session of your annual meeting, you have chosen the theme, "Taxes, Spending, and Freedom." It is a theme both timely and significant. Timely, because in a relatively few weeks the House Ways and Means Committee will report out the tax bill it is now working on in executive session. And significant, because there is no more urgent task confronting the Nation today than the adoption of a program of tax reduction and reform, a program that is at once fair, substantial, and fiscally responsible.

There is no doubt in my mind that such a program will be enacted into law this year. The public testimony on the tax proposals has strengthened my earlier belief that tax reduction is essential. It is no surprise that, on an issue so complex, so far-reaching and that so deeply affects so many people, there is no unanimity of agreement. What is genuinely remarkable is that the understandable and sometimes sharp disagreement on details has in no way weakened the strong and widespread consensus that only a thorough overhaul of our tax system can provide the lasting impetus our economy needs.

More than 200 witnesses have testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax proposals. While their views have differed widely on specifics, only two of these witnesses have disagreed with the central thesis of the President's program, the need for a substantial tax reduction to encourage economic growth. While your organization, for example, has questioned certain details in the President's proposals, it has not questioned its aim.

In fact, you have made it very clear that you strongly support the principle of tax reduction as vital to the continuation of a healthy free economy. The practical question is: What can you actively do to make that goal a reality when you do not agree with all the means proposed to reach it? An excellent answer to that question has just been given by the group of distinguished business leaders who, last week, here in Washington, formed the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 and who drew up a statement of principles upon

which businessmen can unite in support of meaningful tax reduction in 1963.

Certainly, the time is ripe. Four or five months ago, few of us could have realistically expected that the economic conditions for a tax cut would be as favorable as they now seem. For, based upon the performance of our economy in the last few months, our prospects for the year are relatively better than most observers had expected. If the improvement continues, our estimated revenues for fiscal 1964 may well be more than we estimated in January perhaps by as much as a billion dollars, thus reducing the deficit.

Even more important, a tax cut when the economy is reasonably buoyant would be far more effective in carrying us toward full employment than a tax cut when the economy is merely limping along. For the tax program that the President has proposed is designed as a long-range program, a program not merely to shield us from an economic downturn, but to accelerate our economic growth well into the future. The present state of our economy is ideal for the inauguration of that kind of program.

As you are well aware, the aim of the President's tax proposals is to break the iron grip upon our economy of a tax system which helped control inflation during the Second World War and its aftermath, but which now throttles growth. It is a program to promote economic growth by promoting economic freedom. And by economic freedom I mean not only the freedom of the market place, of investment, and of enterprise, but the freedom that is the right of every American, to have the opportunity to work, to grow, and to prosper in accordance with his talents.

Far too many Americans have not had that opportunity for far too long a time. Not for a single month in the past 5 years has unemployment fallen below 5 percent. Yet for the greater part of the preceding 5 years, unemployment was either below or only slightly above the 4-percent level that many regard as reasonably full employment. Last month, 4½ million of our citizens could not find the jobs they sought.

Unless we do something now, the prospects are that many more millions will be unable to find jobs in the future. Next year, those young people who were born in 1946, the first year of the postwar baby boom, will turn 18 and begin to enter our labor force in large numbers. During the mid-sixties our labor force will have to absorb an average annual inflow of around 2,700,000 young people, compared to 1,800,000 during the mid-fifties, an increase of 50 percent. We must be able to provide jobs for all of these young men and women. And we must do it in a time of ever-increasing automation. For the impact of automation that has long been felt among our blue-collar factory workers is now spreading rapidly in the white-collar and service areas.

We welcome the progress of automation. But we cannot accept the unemployment that too often accompanies it. We can, and we must, take steps to meet, with a many-sided response, the twin challenge of automation and a rapidly growing labor force. The Government has a clear and direct responsibility in this area. But it will act only to the extent that the private economy cannot, or does not, meet this challenge.

The President's tax program is evidence of his belief that a free and vigorous private economy can provide our citizens with abundant job opportunities. Should we fail to achieve this kind of economy, let no one imagine that the result would be anything but catastrophic. For instance, Mr. W. P. Gullander, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, recently estimated that, if our economy continues to create jobs no faster than it has during the past 5 years,

then, by 1970, our unemployment rate would soar to a shocking 12.7 percent.

The American people could never tolerate such a result. It would inevitably call forth massive governmental action to provide the jobs that our private economy had not provided. The President's tax program is proof enough that such a prospect is as unwelcome to us in Washington as it must be to you.

High unemployment is at once the most enduring and the most unendurable result of our slow growth over the past 5 years, but it is only one of the many ills which flow from an inadequate economic performance. The likelihood is that without a program of substantial tax reduction, our plants will continue to operate below the levels that businessmen themselves feel they need for most efficient production; that there will be no letup in the pressure upon profit margins; that new investment which, in real terms, is just equally the levels reached 8 years ago, will continue to lag, that we will, in short continue to suffer from the many ills that accompany an economy whose resources and incentives for growth are hampered by an overly restrictive tax system.

As long as our economy is so hampered, we are likely to continue to suffer as well from the chronic budgetary deficits that grow because our economy fails to grow. The record is clear that the deficit we now face is the result of an economy which produces too little, rather than of a government which spends too much. Let us briefly review that record:

We are all well aware that within the past 2 years the Soviet rulers felt enough confidence in their power to confront us with a military challenge on a scale we have not seen since the Berlin blockade, 15 years ago. Fortunately, President Kennedy had, in one of the very first moves of his administration, ordered a rapid and substantial buildup of our military power. It was this increased military strength and the steadfastness of our citizens that enabled us to withstand both the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of last fall. That military buildup was vital to preserve our freedoms. It was also expensive. Our annual defense budget grew by some \$10 billion.

In addition to their military threat, the Soviets have also challenged us in the vast new arena of space. Thanks to a considerable headstart and rockets far larger than ours, they have been able, up to now, to outperform us in manned space flight and to capture the imagination of the world by their feats. But, in the spring of 1961, our Congress agreed with President Kennedy, that we were no longer willing to continue second best in space. It approved a program designed to put an American on the moon before the end of the decade, and hopefully before the arrival of any Soviet space explorer. That decision was extremely costly, but it involved far more than a symbolic race to the moon. It represented our clear determination as a nation that we will not permit the Soviet Union to preempt world leadership in a new and unknown environment whose potential we have scarcely begun to foresee.

These two decisions in defense and space, along with relatively normal increases in other programs vital to the needs of our growing population, have combined to push our expenditures substantially higher than the revenues we collect from our underemployed economy. I mean exactly what I say when I characterize these other increases as relatively normal. Because, for all programs except defense, space, and interest on the public debt, President Kennedy's current 1964 budget recommendations exceed actual 1961 expenditures by only \$4.5 billion, as compared to an increase of \$4.9 billion in these same programs during 3 preceding years, 1958-61. There can be no question

that, if our economy were operating at reasonably full capacity, our tax system would today be producing more than enough revenue to finance our current national needs within a balanced budget. Instead of worrying about deficits we would be enjoying budgetary surpluses.

But the harsh truth is, that unless we release the drag which our tax system now exerts on our economy, we cannot hope to move significantly closer to a balanced budget. In fact, the experience of recent years has shown that exactly the opposite will take place.

Thus, we are faced with what might seem at first to be a paradox: while our present tax rates are so high that they would produce a substantial budget surplus at reasonably full employment, we have little hope of ever achieving that surplus unless we first reduce our tax rates.

Actually, this should not be very mysterious. The explanation is that the major factor in our economic progress, and, indeed, in the progress of any free market economy such as ours, is the vitality of the private sector, both the business community and the consuming public. The across-the-board reduction in our tax rates recommended by the President will stimulate both. We can expect more economic activity, and higher tax revenues, to result. This has been the record in the past, and there is no reason to expect that it will not prove to be the case again. We are not alone in this analysis of the results of tax reduction. One of the clearest statements of this thesis that I have ever seen reads as follows:

"Any appreciable downward revision in tax rates will, of course, cause an immediate reduction in revenues. But there is substantial evidence from the history of tax relief measures, particularly with respect to income taxes, that the initial revenue loss is soon made up by an increase in the tax base against which the lower rates are charged. There is evidence of this not only in our own experience but also in the experience of such countries as Canada, West Germany, and Austria, each of which has enacted several tax relief measures in the post-World War II period."

That statement was made by the National Council of State Chambers of Commerce in its bulletin on Federal Tax Facts, June 4, 1958.

Last year, we took our first important steps in tax relief. They were the enactment of the investment credit and the complete revision and extensive liberalization, for the first time in 20 years, of the tax rules dealing with depreciation. The combined effect of these two actions was to reduce the tax-load on business by some \$2.5 billion a year, the equivalent of a five-point reduction in corporate taxes.

Today, business is reacting to these two measures as we had anticipated. The enlarged flow of new orders for machinery and equipment that marked the opening months of the year, and the recent striking increase in business appropriations for modernization and expansion, can be traced largely to these two actions. Most of you, I am sure, have seen the report in the magazine, *Iron Age*, of the effect of these measures on the steel industry, an increase of 32 percent in depreciation writeoffs.

The investment credit and new depreciation guidelines were a preliminary part of the tax program now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. That program, as you know, offers a broad, top-to-bottom reduction in tax rates, both corporate and personal, accompanied by a number of structural reforms. The overall result would be a reduction of \$10.3 billion in taxes, designed to unleash our economy and allow it to reach its full potential.

The President's program is not weighted in favor of any one sector of the economy at

7. Once again, world communism had succeeded in choosing the point of conflict and crisis in the cold war, and once again, as with South Korea or South Vietnam or West Berlin or Laos, the focus of contention is inside the realm of the free world, not in the Communist realm.

Whatever the precise degrees of blame to be placed on American administrations, past and present, or on Cubans, past and present, the net result is as described above; and in spite of the trade restrictions and the partial efforts of the OAS at diplomatic "isolation" of Cuba, no persuasive evidence has yet developed to justify optimistic assumptions about the future effects of Castroism in the Caribbean and in continental South America.

At the moment Guatemala is holding and in Venezuela the local Communists have been weakened and disorganized. But quick reversals have been a hallmark of the volatile politics of Latin America, and its strains credulity to assume that a general era of stability is now beginning. For countries like Peru and possibly Brazil it is hard to convince oneself that the fundamental forces for integration are stronger than the fundamental forces for disintegration. Latin American Communists believe the contrary, and are relatively quiescent right now only as a matter of strategy, waiting for the time when the United States will relax about Cuba, take its nervous finger off the trigger, and gradually slip into a state of de facto coexistence with Mr. Castro. As we drift in that direction, most Latin governments as well as those European allies anxious to resume trade with Cuba will try to force us further in that direction.

STRATEGY SEEN CHANGING

When northern opinion is adjusted to accommodation, Communist strategies will change again, and with the present electricity dissipated, we shall find it far harder to rouse ourselves to forceful action in the case of some attempted uprising in Cuba or in the case of Communist coups in nearby nations. This is the prospect unless somehow we will find a way to increase our present pressures on Cuba. If they are not increased, they will decrease; it is not in the nature of these things that a status quo can be indefinitely maintained.

Wise and good men are reminding us that a Communist Cuba is not a mortal threat to our vital interests. In and of itself, of course, it is not. But that opens, it does not close, the argument. A Communist Vietnam, or a Communist Laos, or Indonesia, or Venezuela or West Berlin would not be mortal threats, either—in and of themselves and separately considered. But the Communist world strategy of protracted conflict is a strategy of the piecemeal advance. There are only so many pieces on the board. With the capture of Cuba they have taken a tremendously important piece. Dozens of Russian ships would not be plying the Cuban trade and thousands of Russian citizens would not be turned out to cheer Castro, if the Kremlin didn't think so.

in connection with a bill I have introduced today, as a companion bill to one being introduced in the Senate by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, to preserve and designate the Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, located in Sioux County, Nebr., as a national monument in the National Park Service System.

These unique fossil beds are known around the world, and this fame rests principally on the wealth of geologic information and paleontologic information gained from them since their discovery. This may well be the world's largest deposit of prehistoric animal remains, and it is estimated that only about 25 percent have been explored after some 60 years of digging by scientists.

The superintendent of nearby Scottsbluff National Monument estimates that his site now has 96,000 visitors a year and that the Agate Monument could conceivably attract 50,000 per year. The proposed project would include almost 3,000 acres of land, construction of a visitor's center, an Indian artifacts museum, and development of a museum at the fossil quarries. Three stories could be told at the site: First, paleontology of the area dating back 21 million years; second, pioneer ranching; and third, the Indian experiences of Capt. James Cook—Government Indian scout, cattleman, author and amateur bone collector, who purchased Agate Springs in 1887. It was Captain Cook who earlier discovered the first fossil material in an area now recognized to be one of the world's richest finds.

The Regional Director of the National Park Service, Omaha, Nebr., is now preparing a final report of the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, and both Federal and State officials feel that these fossil beds should be preserved for research and future generations. The area could be developed into a prime tourist attraction in addition to neighboring Scottsbluff National Monument, Chimney Rock, the Black Hills, and so forth.

As presently proposed, the cost of the project would run an estimated \$1,750,000—including the acquisition of the land, construction of a visitor center, an Indian artifacts museum, development of a museum at the quarries, and the paving of roads to the fossil sites.

I believe this is a worthwhile project, and I feel it is our duty to protect these fossil quarries for additional research and posterity.

"help wanted" columns in our newspapers indicate the many job opportunities for workers at all levels of the skill ladder.

In order to provide workers, and especially the unemployed, with marketable skills for this age of automation and technological change, we need effective training and retraining programs. It would be a mistake, however, to think that all the job vacancies in our society require a high level of skill. Many persons could qualify if they had the interest and put forth a minimum of personal effort. Mr. Chamberlain presents a thought-provoking column discussing this problem and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE PUZZLE PIECES JUST DON'T FIT

(By John Chamberlain)

The job of us professional commentators, or licensed libertines, as Arthur Krock once called our breed, is to suggest answers to certain perplexing questions. Well, we try. But there are so many contradictions between official claims and statistics, on the one hand, and the evidence of our senses on the other, that the business becomes almost impossible at times.

For example, there are the unemployment figures and the projections therefrom. Automation, so it is said, is putting a hard core of irreclaimable people out of work. Maybe this is true. But the other day I started reading the "help wanted" columns of a daily newspaper. Having just been informed that 50 percent of the unemployed in New England, which happens to be my section of the country, are women, I looked at the "female help wanted" section first.

The results startled me, for, though many of the advertisements called for some kind of training, most of them were asking for a type of schooling or apprenticeship that almost anybody could obtain with even a minimum of get-up-and-go.

How much experience does a woman need in order to act as an attendant in a coin-operated laundromat, for instance? Or to become a cocktail waitress or a part-time counter girl? Or, given a natural gift of sharp eyes, to succeed as a proofreader? Or, given some previous business life, to take a crack at managing a snack bar.

These are some of the jobs that are, at the moment, going begging. And there seem to be scores of openings for typists, and registered nurses, and cleaning women, and dental assistants, and for general office workers, and for waitresses, and for sewing machine operators.

The list of openings for the more obvious types of trained or semitrained women went on and on, occasionally interspersed with a request for some more esoteric skill. Not many, I imagine, could meet the requirements demanded of a mortgage girl or a legal secretary or a claims examiner with a knowledge of surgical instruments. But if such skills are needed in our economy, surely there are good openings for teachers who know how to teach them.

The "male help wanted" columns seemed to be filled with notes of urgency. Barbers, cooks, automobile mechanics, accountants, adjusters, auto seat cover installers, simonizers, concrete masonry workers, counter-men, drill press operators, welders, newsboys, dishwashers, steel warehousemen, rate clerks, registered pharmacists, salesmen of all types and descriptions, porters, plumbers, pressmen, clam and oyster openers, tool and diemakers, delivery vehicle drivers, science and mathematics teachers, commercial artists, service station attendants, motel managers, linotype operators—well, the list eventually became a droning bore to read.

Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, Sioux County, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert a statement in the RECORD

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by John Chamberlain in the New York Journal-American points to the fact that there are many more jobs going begging in our society than is commonly realized. As Chamberlain says, the long

1963

5945, by the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; H.R. 5946, by the Honorable Leo O'Brien, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs; H.R. 5947, by the Honorable JOHN KYL, member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and H.R. 5948, by myself. These four bills were introduced on April 30, 1963.

On May 1, 1963, the Honorable JACOB H. GILBERT introduced H.R. 5991, and on May 6, 1963, the Honorable HUGH L. CAREY introduced H.R. 6047; the Honorable WILLIAM FITTS RYAN introduced H.R. 6076, and the Honorable HENRY GONZALEZ introduced H.R. 6083. These eight bills are all identical bills and they are entitled:

To establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

These bills have been introduced in response to Joint Resolution No. 1, adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, on December 3, 1962, proposing to the Congress of the United States of America the procedure for establishing the final political status of the people of Puerto Rico.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Juan Star, May 1, 1963]

THE LONG, LONG TRAIL

The resolution introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress yesterday is an extremely delicate measure. It is also a historical document that proposes to lay the legislative groundwork for a precedent-setting formula for establishing a permanent relationship between citizens and the country of their citizenship.

The resolution contains a number of key phrases long discussed here as indispensable to the enactment of legislation that would give constitutional validity to any compact agreed to by the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

Before any such compact can have validity, permanence, and irrevocability, the Congress must recognize the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico and their inherent right and juridical capacity to enter into such a compact.

Congress is being asked to make such a recognition in the resolution. The purpose of the carefully drafted wording of the measure is to put an end, for all time, to charges of colonialism by the United States in Puerto Rico, and to legalize beyond any doubt the decision of the people when they choose among Commonwealth, statehood, and independence, the final political status of Puerto Rico.

The formula for achieving that desirable end, as represented by the resolution introduced in Congress, is an admirable one. It embodies the principle of democracy by recognizing that the people are the highest authority in the process of self-determination.

We would want to say here that the prospects of success are as good as the formula itself. We cannot, because the long, long trail between introduction of this sensitive resolution and its approval by Congress has many windings that can come upon tricky detours without warning.

The delicacy of the wording requires that the resolution be approved almost intact, as written. Any one of various amendments could nullify its high purpose, and the Congress is composed of 535 Members who have the right, which they cherish exceedingly high, of making changes that satisfy their sense of duty and responsibility in any legislation that comes before them.

Whether the resolution is approved in a

manner that meets the objective of its architects, or is defeated, or dies in committee, should not alter the fact that the job must be done. The status debate will end one day, and it should be terminated as soon as possible.

When all who have an interest have been heard, we sincerely hope the final result will be congressional approval of legislation that will resolve Puerto Rico's political destiny in a manner that meets with the approval of its people.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1963]
PERPLEXITIES OF STATUS

Three members of the House Interior Committee have introduced a bill that offers the best method of tackling the question of Puerto Rico's status. The legislation would create a 12-member commission that would draft a proposed compact of permanent union between the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

The compact would go into effect if the following conditions were met: (1) adoption by Congress of authorizing legislation after receipt of the commission's report; (2) ratification of the compact by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum in which three choices would be submitted—an amended version of the present Commonwealth status, independence and statehood. In the event the majority of voters choose either independence or statehood, the results would be transmitted to Congress "for such action as it may consider appropriate."

The virtue of the commission proposal is that it skates around some fixed constitutional objections and at the same time provides ample time for deliberation. By creating the commission, Congress would not be committing itself or any future Congress to acceptance of the recommendation. The mechanism envisaged by the legislation is essentially a repetition of the procedures used in framing the original measure that created the Commonwealth a decade ago.

It is quite true that Puerto Rico poses some special problems for our Federal system. The question is whether that system is flexible enough to accommodate the needs of a people who want to remain within the United States without acquiring a political status that would be ruinous to the economy of an overpopulated island. Certainly the Founding Fathers did not contemplate the special issues raised by Puerto Rico, but neither did they foresee a trip to the moon. A living constitution must be continually reinterpreted in the light of fresh circumstances. It is in this perspective that Congress should consider the Puerto Rican bill.

Coming Events of Communism in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in all the hue and cry about Castro and Cuba, there are a few outstanding facts which appear clearly to those who take the trouble to analyze the situation.

Coleridge once said:

If men could learn from history, what lessons it might teach us. But passion and party blind our eyes, and the light which experience gives is a lantern on the stern—which shines only on the waves behind us.

The lantern of Coleridge shines on waves which are now behind us—and we

should open our eyes and see what the lantern reveals. We should do this regardless of passion and party, for only in this way can we hope to save ourselves from the consequences of our failure to learn lessons from the past history of the march of communism toward its goal—enslavement of the world and the peoples of the world.

I was impressed with a column written by Eric Sevareid, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, of May 7, "Man and the Times." Mr. Sevareid's article is called "Cuban Issue Not Clear for Debate."

Mr. Sevareid outlined seven facts which we should seriously consider, in all our debate on the pros and cons of Cuba and the handling of that very controversial issue by several administrations. His last point—that "once again, world communism has succeeded in choosing the point of conflict and crisis in the cold war" should be a sobering reminder to all of us that we are not dealing with, nor should the security of this country ever be a partisan issue—but with a long view and an impassionate evaluation of the outcome, as far as Cuba is concerned—of the continuing battle between communism and capitalism.

Under unanimous consent I would like to include Mr. Sevareid's column with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The column follows:

CUBAN ISSUE NOT CLEAR FOR DEBATE

(By Eric Sevareid)

Cuba may well be, as now predicted, the prime issue in the national politics of 1964. But unless the issue is clarified far beyond its present state it will be a rhetorical question, not a question for true debate. Alternative policies are required for true debate and all we have on either side, so far, is attitudes.

With justice, the President has insisted that his critics show more precision in their prescriptions for handling Cuba; but with equal justice his critics can insist on more precision from the administration. What we are now witnessing is a collision of two fog banks. This never clears the air, in nature or in politics; it merely produces fog of double thickness.

WHAT HAS GONE BEFORE

How uncertain the future course, there can be little uncertainty about what the immediate past has produced:

1. The Russians now possess a military, political, and propaganda base in the heart of our area of security and influence.
2. Their troops in Cuba constitute a "trip wire," paralyzing to American action, as our troops in Berlin constitute a trip wire there.
3. Cities and installations of the U.S. mainland are now open to damage by conventional weapons, and have become, therefore, in some degree hostage to Communist purposes. Theoretically, at least, the Russians could damage us by proxy, their method elsewhere, without themselves being directly involved.
4. Fidel Castro's physical hold on the island is complete, with the underground movement facing probable extinction.
5. The mass of Cuban manpower in exile is now a "blown instrument," a handicap and thorn in our side, not a weapon for our uses.
6. A foreign policy quarrel of serious proportions is engulfing an administration which has not yet found its feet in the area of its domestic policies and programs.